1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 TROY L. NEVELS, 11 Plaintiff, No. CIV S-03-1590 MCE PAN P 12 VS. 13 CHERYL PLILER, et al., 14 Defendants. **ORDER** 15 On May 31, 2006, defendants filed a motion for summary judgment pursuant to 16 17 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56. Plaintiff has not opposed the motion. 18 Local Rule 78-230(m) provides in part: "Failure of the responding party to file 19 written opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to the granting of the motion " On September 24, 2004, plaintiff was advised of 20 21 the requirements for filing an opposition to the motion and that failure to oppose such a motion 22 may be deemed a waiver of opposition to the motion. 23 Local Rule 11-110 provides that failure to comply with the Local Rules "may be 24 grounds for imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the 25 inherent power of the Court." In the order filed September 24, 2004, plaintiff was advised that ///// 26

Case 2:03-cv-01590-MCE-EFB Document 29 Filed 07/18/06 Page 2 of 2

failure to comply with the Local Rules may result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed.

Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within thirty days of the date of this order, plaintiff shall file an opposition, if any he has, to the motion for summary judgment or a statement of non-opposition. Failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed pursuant Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). DATED: July 17, 2006.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

neve1590.46o